

D.P.U. 94-40

Application of Western Massachusetts Electric Company, under the provisions of G.L. c. 164, § 94G(a), for approval by the Department of Public Utilities of the Company's annual performance program relating to fuel procurement and use.

APPEARANCES: Steven H. Klionsky, Esq.
260 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110

FOR: WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS ELECTRIC
COMPANY
Petitioner

I. INTRODUCTION

On March 1, 1994, pursuant to G.L. c. 164, § 94G(a), Western Massachusetts Electric Company ("WMECo" or "Company") submitted a petition to the Department requesting approval of proposed generating unit performance goals for the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. Section 94G(a) requires each electric company to file with the Department annual performance programs that provide for the efficient and cost-effective operation of its generating units. Each company's performance program must include proposed unit and system performance goals for availability factor ("AF"), equivalent availability factor ("EAF"), capacity factor ("CF"), forced outage rate ("FOR"), and heat rate ("HR"). The petition was docketed as D.P.U. 94-40.

Pursuant to notice duly issued, the Department conducted a hearing on the Company's petition on April 27, 1994. In support of its petition, the Company sponsored the testimony of Robert A. Baumann, manager in fuel accounting and recovery, and Robert B. Burke, senior availability engineer in the fossil/hydro engineering and operations (Tr. at 5-6). The evidentiary record includes seven exhibits and two responses to record requests.

II. WMECO'S SUPPLY-SIDE PORTFOLIO

The Company exclusively owns and operates West Springfield 3, a 107 MW fossil unit, and three jet units: Doreen 10 (18.5 MW); Woodland Road 10 (18.5 MW); and West Springfield 10 (19.2 MW)

(Exh. WM-1, at 4). WMECo owns 19.0 percent (123.1 MW) of Millstone 1, a 647.7 MW nuclear unit; 19.0 percent (166.2 MW) of Millstone 2, a 874.5 MW nuclear unit; and 12.2 percent (140.6 MW) of Millstone 3, a 1148.7 MW nuclear unit (Exh. DPU-6). All three Millstone units are owned and operated by Northeast Utilities ("NU").¹ The Company also owns 19.0 percent (51.3 MW) of each of four 270 MW pumped storage units, Northfield 1, 2, 3, and 4 (id.).

Under a life-of-the-unit contract WMECo receives 9.5 percent (55.4 MW) of the output from Connecticut Yankee, a 583.2 MW nuclear unit, which is owned and operated by Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; 2.3 percent (11.7 MW) from Vermont Yankee, a 521.8 MW nuclear unit, owned and operated by Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; and 2.7 percent (23.7 MW) from Maine Yankee, a 880 MW nuclear unit, owned and operated by Maine Yankee Nuclear Power Company (id.; Exh. DPU-5). The remainder of the Company's supply purchases comes from small power producers, such as Springfield (7.5 MW) and Masspower (54.0 MW) (Exh. WM-1, at 32).

For the purpose of distinguishing those units that contribute most to system costs, performance programs identify major and minor units. Major units are units which contributed at least five percent of the system generation (as measured in megawatt-hours) in any of the

¹ WMECo is a wholly-owned subsidiary of NU of Hartford, Connecticut, a public utility holding company.

previous three years, or units in which the Company has at least a 100 megawatt entitlement. Any unit that does not qualify as a major unit is a minor unit. The Company's major units are Connecticut Yankee; Millstone 1, 2, and 3; Maine Yankee; and West Springfield 3 (id. at 4).

III. THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED GOALS

The Company proposed goals for Connecticut Yankee; Millstone 1, 2, and 3; Vermont Yankee; Maine Yankee; Northfield 1, 2, 3, and 4; West Springfield 3 and 10; Doreen 10; and Woodland Road 10 (Exh. WM-1, at 1). WMECo submitted proposed goals for its major and minor units that were calculated in a manner consistent with the methodologies approved by the Department in Western Massachusetts Electric Company, D.P.U. 93-48 (1993) (id.).

Under the Company's goals proposal, the EAF goals for major and minor units were set at values corresponding to each unit's Target Unit Availability ("TUA"), the availability targets that the New England Power Pool ("NEPOOL") sets for each member utility's units under its Performance Incentive Program. In developing its proposed goals, the Company used the TUAs approved by the New England Power Supply Planning Committee ("NEPLAN") and adopted by the NEPOOL Executive Committee on April 21, 1993, which became effective on May 1, 1993 (id. at 11).

The Company calculated the remaining performance goals (i.e., AF, CF, FOR, and HR) in accordance with the major unit methodology

approved in previous proceedings, regardless of whether units met the major or minor unit criteria² (Exh. WM-1, at 7). The Company also calculated system goals in a manner consistent with the methodology that has been approved by the Department in previous proceedings³ (id.).

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Department has reviewed the Company's goals proposal and finds that it includes all the units that should be included in the Company's generating unit performance program. The Department also

² AF goals were derived by adding to the EAF goal the ratio of average annual equivalent derated hours for the last three years to average annual period hours (Exh. WM-1, at 7). CF goals were derived by multiplying the ratio of the three-year average CF to the three-year average EAF by the EAF goal (id.). FOR goals were derived by dividing projected FOH by the sum of projected FOH and SH (id.). Projected FOH were developed by dividing the three-year average FOH by the three-year average PH, then multiplying by the PH in the performance year (id.). Projected SH were developed by calculating the ratio of three-year average SH to three-year average AH and multiplying that ratio by the AF goal, then by PH in the performance year (id.). HR goals were set at the best (lowest) annual HR obtained during the previous three years (id.).

³ System goals for EAF, AF, CF, FOR, and HR were developed from the weighted averages of the goals for the individual units (Exh. WM-1, at 7). The weighting factor for each unit was the ratio of unit to system generation as projected during the performance year (id.). Projected generation for each unit was calculated by multiplying the Company's entitlement in each unit's capacity by its CF goal (id.). Projected system generation was calculated as the sum of projected unit generations across the system (id.). For the system HR goal calculation, the weighting factor for each fossil and nuclear unit was developed as a ratio of unit to system generation, excluding the Company's hydro facilities which are Northfield Units 1 through 4 (id.).

finds that proposed goals for major and minor units were calculated in a manner consistent with the methodologies approved by the Department in D.P.U. 93-48.

In D.P.U. 93-48, the Department found that several advantages would result if goals were adopted based on NEPOOL TUAs: (1) the methodology would produce the same EAF goal for generating units included in more than one company's supply portfolio; and (2) the methodology would reduce the time, effort, and expense incurred by a company in preparing goal-setting filings and by the Department in reviewing those filings.

In this proceeding, the Department reaffirms its findings in D.P.U. 93-48 and finds that the efficient and effective administration of WMECo's performance program is best served by the goals proposal submitted by the Company in Exhibits WM-1 and DPU-6. The Department approves the goal-setting methodologies implicit in that proposal, and the resultant unit and system performance goals, as identified in Exhibit DPU-6. The approved WMECo unit and system goals based on NEPOOL TUAs are identified in Table 1 attached to this Order.

V. ORDER

Accordingly, after due notice, hearing, and consideration, it is

ORDERED: That the generating unit and system performance goals for Western Massachusetts Electric Company for the period June

1, 1994 through May 31, 1995, shall be those contained in Table 1 attached to this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That, as part of its next performance filing, the Company shall submit potential performance goals based on the NEPOOL TUAs effective at that time, and shall comply with the requirements set forth in this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That, pursuant to G.L. c. 164, § 94G and § 2.6(b) of the Department's performance program guidelines, dated December 8, 1981, the Company shall report on its progress under the annual performance program with each filing made pursuant to these guidelines; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That the Company shall file its next performance program goals by March 1, 1995, and the next performance period shall run from June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

By Order of the Department,

Kenneth Gordon, Chairman

Barbara Kates Garnick, Commissioner

Mary Clark Webster, Commissioner

Appeal as to matters of law from any final decision, order or ruling of the Commission may be taken to the Supreme Judicial Court by an aggrieved party in interest by the filing of a written petition praying that the Order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part.

Such petition for appeal shall be filed with the Secretary of the Commission within twenty days after the date of service of the decision, order or ruling of the Commission, or within such further time as the Commission may allow upon request filed prior to the expiration of twenty days after the date of service of said decision, order or ruling. Within ten days after such petition has been filed, the appealing party shall enter the appeal in the Supreme Judicial Court sitting in Suffolk County by filing a copy thereof with the Clerk of said Court. (Sec. 5, Chapter 25, G.L. Ter. Ed., as most recently amended by Chapter 485 of the Acts of 1971).